



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

action of the forces which are working out the federal unity of continents and the general welfare of the people. The other parts of the continent must be as ready as we for the union, before it can rightly come about.

Again, the President says that "war should never be entered upon until every agency of peace has failed." We wish he might have omitted his "almost" in the next sentence, and said that "peace is preferable to war in every contingency." However, if "every agency of peace" is faithfully and patiently tried, our country will never find a contingency where war will be necessary.

The reasons which he gives for urging the Senate to ratify the arbitration treaty are weighty ones, and really exhaust the important grounds for such action. They are our own initiative in bringing about this treaty, that adjustment of difficulties by judicial methods has been the leading feature of our foreign policy throughout our entire national history, the glorious example of two of the greatest nations being controlled by reason and peace, the likelihood that other nations will follow the example, and "our duty to mankind."

The last reason, "our duty to mankind," is the greatest of all those assigned, and we are heartily glad that the President put the subject on this high ground of our moral obligation as a nation. As to the treaty being the result of our own initiative, Great Britain has about as good claims here as we have.

The British Parliament passed in 1873 the first resolution ever adopted by a national legislative body in favor of the principle of arbitration. Before the action of our Congress in 1890, referred to by the President, the famous deputation of thirteen prominent English public men had been to this country with the memorial signed by two hundred thirty-four members of Parliament, asking virtually for an arbitration treaty with this country. The famous House of Commons resolution of 1893 was as much request as it was response to our resolution of 1890 which was in favor of arbitration in general but made no specific reference to Great Britain. It is true that the negotiations for the treaty now pending were begun by Secretary Gresham, but after his death they were resumed by Lord Salisbury from the other side, and not by our Secretary of State. On the whole, looking at the prominent part which our government has had in the practice of arbitration as well as what it has done to bring about this treaty, we are sufficiently entitled to the credit of the initiative in the matter of this treaty to lay upon us a solemn obligation to ratify it without delay.

President McKinley's hearty endorsement of the treaty and recommendation of an early ratification has met with the warmest approval throughout the country, and has given much encouragement to the friends of the convention in the Senate.

### INCREASE OF THE BRITISH ARMY.

According to the *Herald of Peace* the British Government proposes to begin this year to increase the size of its army, which has heretofore been considered "a negligible quantity," as compared with the navy. Here is what the *Herald* says:

"At last we have some serious cause for anxiety. Mr. Arnold Foster's article in this month's *Cosmopolis*, on the New French Naval Programme, shows the latest development of the mad rivalry, which has been so often condemned by the very statesmen who have indulged in it. He proves that France has now entered on a serious rivalry with Great Britain in naval armaments. She proposes to increase her Naval Budget by £10,000,000, for the construction of new ships, and the recent debate in the French Chamber, as well as other evidence, makes it clear that these great efforts have England in view.

This country has led the way in ruinous naval and military expenditure.

Hitherto, however, the rivalry has been confined, on our side at least, to purely naval matters. Our Army, we have been told over and over again, was to some extent a negligible quantity, because we could never hope to compete with the great military Powers. It was expensive notwithstanding.

All that is to be changed. The restless military spirit is abroad, and the Government proposes to increase the numbers of the Army, while the net increase in the Army Estimates, for 1897-8, amounts to nearly £100,000.

Apparently, jealous of the success of the naval department, the sister service has now its representatives crying, "Give! Give!"

The total sum asked for by the Government is £21,162,422, besides the great sums included in the Supplementary Votes—the highest amount hitherto demanded for our comparatively small army, which, however, is to be small no longer.

In the Debate on the Estimates, the remarkable statement was made, and, as it went unchallenged in the House, it is presumably true, that last year the defences of the Empire cost £63,000,000.

That unprecedented amount will be henceforth increased, so that the total expenditure this year will be not only greater than ever it has been, but the increase will be in quite a new department. If we are to enter into rivalry with other powers in that direction, it is impossible to say what will follow. This is only the thin end of the wedge. Conscription will be the next step, as one of our "necessities" (indeed, a certain class of politicians have already begun to insist upon its adoption), and the next, and the following ones, who shall predict?

It is already universally acknowledged that "overloaded armaments account for the present deadlock in European politics." We in this country have, so far, mainly contributed towards this by the supremacy of our fleet. Now if we are to enter on this new pathway of army increase, as well, we shall be doubly culpable.

Moreover, the time for this, as we have said, is most inopportune. When, conjointly with the United States of America on the one side, we are taking the lead in the promotion of pacific methods and in the introduction of law and reason into international affairs, that, on the other hand, we should be setting out upon a new line of effort

to make the burden of humanity intolerable, and to deepen the civilized midnight of the world, is as deplorable as it seems incredible.

It is, however, part of the struggle between the two civilizations—the Christian and the Pagan, which is going on continually.

The problem of the future is: "Which is to triumph?" As to the ultimate issue there cannot be the shadow of a doubt. But, if this new national departure be followed up, and the mad policy pursued, the retribution to this country will be terrible indeed."

It has been foreseen for a long time that sooner or later England would enter actively on army extension, if she did not stop her monstrous naval expansion. It is impossible, in these days of increased facilities for the rapid transportation of troops, for a nation to go into the war preparation business in any direction without taking up ultimately all lines of it. England's great war fleet has provoked the growth of militarism everywhere on land and sea. Her statesmen have talked virtuously about the deplorableness of the "bloated armaments" of the European continent, and have flattered themselves that England was playing the good Christian by developing only her navy and adhering to the voluntary system. Now she finds that the fleets of the other powers are growing rapidly and that in case of hostilities they would be able to land large sections of the great continental armies on her shores in spite of her. She must, therefore, enlarge her army, and, as the *Herald* says, Conscription will inevitably follow in time.

The British fleet and naval stations all about in every available place have been, as we have more than once stated, the chief provocation to this country to build up a navy. It is in vain for members of the British Government and of Parliament to protest that the construction of a new naval station on Santa Lucia has no possible connection with the relations of Great Britain to the United States; large numbers of the people of this country will not believe them. The building of such a station, and all the old stations, *has* to do with the relations of Great Britain to this country and to all other countries, whether directly intended or not. Such movements of the British naval system give at least a show of reason to the irrational opposition of certain United States senators and others to the pending arbitration treaty, which they say is only a British snare in disguise.

The course of militarism in the United States will be the same as in Great Britain. We flatter ourselves that we need nothing but a navy and coast defences. Warships we must have, a lot of them, big and swift, because England and other nations have them. We have not the courage to refuse to follow a detestable example. The result will be, persuade ourselves to the contrary as we may, that when we have at enormous expense put our navy and our coast defences on a par with those of the

other great powers, we shall find ourselves driven by the logic of the situation to increase our army and ultimately to adopt enforced military service. The leaven of militarism, if kept in the national barrel at all, will ultimately spread to all parts of the contents. The only way to escape this fate is to stop, where we ought to stop, with the navy. If Secretary Long, who is in principle a genuine friend of international peace and a strong advocate of arbitration, would seriously recommend, in his first annual report, that the United States navy is already large enough and that when the ships now in construction are completed no more ought to be built, he would accomplish a service for this country and for the civilized world such as no Secretary of the Navy in any country has ever performed, a service like that which Mr. Olney has accomplished in the State Department. If this country or any other had the courage to stop short and declare that it would never take another step in any direction in the extension of the deplorable system of modern militarism, the very "stars in their courses" would defend both its safety and its honor.

#### THE VETO OF THE IMMIGRATION BILL.

The last important official act of President Cleveland was the veto of the Immigration Restriction Bill. On the whole, we believe the President was amply justified in returning the bill without his approval, for, though some of its provisions might have remedied a part of the evils of unrestricted immigration, others would certainly have worked mischief in quarters where least of all we ought to think of creating friction. The President's reasons for the veto may be thus summarized:

The provision of the bill that immigrants over sixteen years of age who cannot read and write the English or some other language, though physically and morally capable, shall be excluded, he thinks to be a "radical departure" from our national policy heretofore of welcoming all who come to us, "except those whose moral or physical condition or history threatens danger to our national welfare and safety." This policy he thinks has been productive of vast benefit in helping to develop the resources of our country, and if it is to be abandoned its disadvantages at the present time ought to be clearly apparent. Besides, reading and writing do not in his judgment provide a proper test of fitness. Many of those who cannot read and write do excellent service as peaceful laborers, while some of the most troublesome of those who come are able to read and write. The accompanying provision that the parent or grandparent, over fifty years of age, the wife or minor child of an immigrant entitled to enter, may come with him or be sent for, provided the immigrant is able to support them, is considered by Mr. Cleveland "indefinite and inadequate." Though intended to prevent the separation of families,